DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 773 TE 000 759

By-Dyer, Prudence, Ed.

1968 CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS (THIRD NCTE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE HUMANITIES, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 5-7, 1968).

National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.

Pub Date 68

Note-13p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.60

Descriptors-*CONFERENCE REPORTS, COURSE CONTENT, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, CURRICULUM EVALUATION, *HUMANITIES, *HUMANITIES INSTRUCTION, *SECONDARY EDUCATION, TEACHING METHODS

This report of the National Conference on the Humanities includes summaries, with excerpts, of four major addresses--(1) "What the Humanities Programs in Schools Ought to Be" by Harry S. Broudy, (2) "Problems and Advantages of the Culture-Epoch Approach to the Humanities" by John R. Dahl, (3) "Humanities: A Great Ideas Course" by Morris Saxe, and (4) "The New Humanities and the Twenty-First Century" by Robert Saudek. In addition, discussion group reports consider existing programs, necessary criteria for humanities programs, the assessment of popular types of humanities courses, a design for a good humanities program, and projected ideas for the participants' own schools. Finally, conference chairman Jerry Walker poses a series of unanswered questions as to what humanities programs might become. (DL)

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1968 Conference Highlights

NCTE'S THIRD NATIONAL CONFERENCE ASSESSES HUMANITIES PROGRAMS

Four hundred teachers, administrators, professors, and other educators reviewed the status of the humanities in the schools and considered criteria for existing and emerging programs at the Third National Conference on the Humanities held in Chicago in early May. Jerry L. Walker, University of Illinois, was Conference Director.

Principal speakers Harry S. Broudy and Robert Saudek talked of what humanities programs should be and what might become of the new humanities of the twenty-first century. Barry Ulanov, John Dahl, Morris Saxe, and Robert Lucid analyzed strengths and weaknesses of the principal patterns of existing humanities courses. Susan Jacoby, Fred Wieck, Rosemary Kelley, Sheila Schwartz, Richard Tyre, William Clauss, Prudence Dyer, Richard Scanlon, and others working in humanities education led large or small discussion groups considering criteria, characteristics, and implementation of good humanities programs. John W. Parker oriented the group to the Chicago Art Institute prior to the evening at the Institute. Imogene Bercaw, Marie Staneck, and Wallace Smith demonstrated creative projects in art, language, and drama.

Members of the local committee were James Berkley (chairman), Rita Hansen, Lola Bane, James Morgan. Representatives of the NCTE staff were Executive Secretary Robert F. Hogan and Coordinators G. Rodney Morisset and Richard Adler.

ED022773

TE 000 759

Conference Highlights reports on the Third National Conference on the Humanities sponsored by NCTE, Chicago, Illinois, May 5-7, 1968, and is edited by Prudence Dyer, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa.

EXCERPTS[1] FROM "WHAT THE HUMANITIES PROGRAMS IN SCHOOLS OUGHT TO BE"

The humanities have been selected as a hope for a restoration of respect for the human essence, as a very old means for a very old task--the teaching of values. In the mind of the school board member, the parent, the newspaper editor, and the legislator, the remedy for all troubles, public and private, is for the school to teach values. But what values, whose values, and by what right? These are no longer academic questions. For example, consider the school's predicament with respect to the redemption of the disadvantaged. The schools are to redeem them, but not by imposing middle-class values upon them. However, if one asks in what way the disadvantaged are disadvantaged, he is told that they lack the means to achieve what seem suspiciously like the middle-class values.

The life outcome anticipated from the humanities course is some sort of value commitment of the pupil, some set of operating norms that will guide the person forever after in his choices, especially of some life style. The school outcomes--those which might be discernible at the end of the course--that might have a fighting chance of eventuating in the anticipated life outcomes would be distinctive habits of perceiving, imagining, and thinking or, if you like, forms of feeling and willing that have been disciplined by the study of the humanities.

The humanities course should not aim at adding to the pupil's empirical knowledge about the cosmos, man, and his culture. The sciences are the proper repositories of such knowledge, and the humanities are not good substitutes for the sciences. Neither are they profitably used as materials for enriching those sciences.

What is envisioned by the renewed humanities, I suggest, is the habit of enlightened cherishing, or the quest for what is really good, and true, and beautiful in human life. These two words, enlightened cherishing, encompass both the commitment of the individual to certain values and the standards by which he justifies the commitment.

Many courses in the high school curriculum are humanistic only in the sense that they give the student knowledge about cherishing. If this charge is well founded, then something other than this mode of instruction is justified, either by new courses or by reorganization of old ones that will stress the shaping of taste rather than the imparting of knowledge.

---

[1] In the excerpts of this and following speeches, the words of the author are used without ellipses. In some instances changes in capitalization or other such editorial minutiae have been made in order to have the ideas of the authors flow smoothly. In each instance, manuscripts of eight to twenty pages have been abstracted to a few paragraphs, retaining the words and spirit of the original.

If enlightened cherishing is the distinctive contribution of the humanities course to the outcomes of schooling, it should guide the choice of materials and approach so as not to lose this distinctiveness. A simple revival of the literary works in the classical curriculum is out of the question, as are approaches such as the revival of the study of belles lettres or a kind of allied arts course. These are already represented in the curriculum.

These facts seem to indicate that the most promising direction for the humanities course is to do value education by means of aesthetic education. Let other portions of the curriculum take care of the discursive, didactic aspect of value education, but in the humanities let the value quest be presented directly as it occurs in a small, highly select set of works of art from diverse media. Hence the choice will favor exemplars that embody both artistic excellence and high value import.

The method of teaching suitable for the course objectives is what might be called aesthetic analysis. Poems, novels, epics, myths, paintings, buildings capture our aesthetic attention by their formal structure, on the one hand, and by stimulating our imagination, on the other. To become enlightened in our cherishing is to learn to respond knowingly to works of the imagination designed for the imagination.

Aesthetic analysis is formulable into a teaching method and can be applied to any art form; it is adaptable to various levels of learning readiness, and the results can, I believe, be evaluated with a fair amount of confidence. If done well and for a sufficient time, it should produce enlightened cherishing and a commitment to its importance.

It is only when educators believe that the rational powers of man enable him to understand the essence of man and that his will can shape his life accordingly that they can meaningfully search for that essence in the humanities. With this faith we can continue the search even if we are not successful, but we cannot in simple honesty go on with it if we do not believe that the search is itself meaningful.

--Harry S. Broudy

PARTICIPANTS DISCUSS EXISTING PROGRAMS

Teachers from nineteen representative types of humanities programs outlined their objectives, organization, content, and methods at round table discussions. These ranged from K-12 approaches to humanities programs (George Beckett, James A. Garfield Schools, Garrettsville, Ohio) to courses built around extensive use of films (Robert Geller, Mamaroneck High School, Mamaroneck, New York) to the impact of school humanities programs upon college freshmen courses (Sister Mary Ruth, Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois).

Numbers of syllabi were available, and in some instances they may yet be obtained by writing to schools whose programs appear in NCTE's new listing, "Annotated Humanities Programs."

CRITERIA GENERATED FOR HUMANITIES PROGRAMS

Meeting in small group sessions by areas of interest, participants began to generate criteria which later were refined somewhat in the large group session. Chairman Richard Scanlon raised the question asked in several groups: is the humanities course a new course in its own right, or is it a corridor leading to a new curriculum? Support was found for both positions.

The following criteria emerged from the notes of recorders from the several sessions and from the remarks of panelists Rodney Smith, Jerome O'Grady, James Hoetker, and Sanford Williams.

For teacher selection: Does he have (1) a healthy self-concept? (2) a reverence for scholarship? (3) thorough knowledge of eastern and/or western culture and their interrelationships? (4) thorough knowledge of institutions and their values? (5) respect for the idealism of youth? (6) healthy understanding of the value of the establishment? (7) ability to relate to youth? (8) a good sense of humor?

For teacher preparation: Do the school and the university (1) consider ways to help the teacher-in-service and the teacher-in-preparation develop understandings necessary for teaching in humanities programs? (2) allow time and encouragement and funds for team and individual planning and for acquiring appropriate materials and other resources?

For the teacher and the learner: Does the teacher in his approach to the study provide opportunities for the child to (1) understand himself? (2) identify and cultivate his interests, talents, and other strengths? (3) recognize aspects of his own heritage? (4) see subject or surface form as only one aspect of the total aesthetic and humanistic experience? (5) analyze, compare, synthesize, and evaluate the several components of the humanities? (6) solve problems in communicating his own ideas in artistic form? (7) enjoy experiences with literature, art, music, history, dance, and other art forms at increasing levels of maturity? (8) establish habits, interests, and skills for spending satisfying leisure? (9) find unifying concepts in relating his understandings in several disciplines? (10) grow in a sense of kinship with all humanity?

EDUCATORS ASSESS POPULAR TYPES OF HUMANITIES COURSES

Last year's NCTE survey on existing humanities programs revealed four principal types of courses in operation: Culture-Epoch, Great Ideas, American Studies, and Aesthetic Structure. Accordingly, educators closely associated with each of these types were asked to analyze the limitations and potentialities of the several approaches. John R. Dahl, Professor of History, University of Illinois, spoke on the Culture-Epoch approach; Morris Saxe, Dean of Humanities, Northport High School, Long Island, New York, on the Great Ideas; Robert Lucid, Executive Secretary, American Studies Association, on American Studies; and Barry Ulanov, Professor of English, Barnard College, on Aesthetic Structure.

EXCERPTS FROM "PROBLEMS AND ADVANTAGES OF THE CULTURE-EPOCH APPROACH TO THE HUMANITIES"

Let us begin by defining terms: "The humanities," according to Charles Keller, "embrace literature, languages, music, art, history, and philosophy. In broader terms the humanities are concerned with the thoughts, creations and actions of man--in the past and in the present. They tell man about his roots, his origins, his neighbors, and himself. They impel him to ask basic questions and to seek answers to them: Who am I? Where have I come from? What is the meaning of life? What can I do to become and remain an effective, responsible member of society? The humanities have to do with making man more human. They are part of what I can call an Inner Space Program. We have an Outer Space Program and are spending millions of dollars to put men on the moon. We need an Inner Space Program to put men into their own hearts and minds." How relevant this definition of Dr. Keller's is in the light of the tragic events of this spring.

For a definition of the Culture-Epoch approach I turn to the stated objectives taken from some of the representative syllabi which I examined at the NCTE offices. One school said this approach "concentrates on great periods of man's development when he seemed to synthesize the efforts of the past or entered a new transitional period of development." Under this rubric some of the favorite topics were Classical Greece, Age of Faith, Age of Romanticism, etc.

Now I turn to an appraisal of the Culture-Epoch approach to the humanities. First, some of the courses strike me as being traditional in that, by design, they attempt the cardinal sin of "covering" history from Adam to the atom. Second, it is evident that such courses are often one-man operations, involving no team teaching nor any sincere attempt at being interdisciplinary in nature. Third, with rare exceptions, almost all Culture-Epoch approaches are exclusively western civilization point of view. Fourth, some courses which employ the Great Books approach seem somehow to be devoid of the personal involvement of teachers, a problem characterizing what seem to be on paper the more successful courses.

Fifth, I suspect that some courses because of a tightly structured syllabus still tend to be too didactic in that they do not allow for student search and inquiry. Sixth, some teachers still lack the courage to select areas to be studied at the expense of others. Seventh, I failed to find many syllabi which indicated that primary source materials were used to any extent in studying man in the various Culture-Epochs under examination. Eighth--and here I reflect the fears of many of my colleagues, professional historians who cite the fact that Culture-Epoch humanities courses make a sham out of history as a discipline--is the fear that under the guise of history the "generalists" have a field day, making loose with both facts and interpretations.

I have called these problems, not disadvantages, and one could nit-pick ad infinitum; but now I would rather look at the advantages of humanities courses which employ the Culture-Epoch approach.

First of all, almost all humanities courses require the most sophisticated type of team effort for planning, development, and teaching. Each member of the team contributes in a very personal way, while at the same time the end result is the best of a group effort.

The Culture-Epoch approach casts history in its proper role, that of man's story in its totality, not just the traditional political, economic, social perspective. And man seen as a creative individual, in reaction to the world around him and in response to a variety of stimuli, comes off more of a human being than a myth. He has relevance for today's students.

The Culture-Epoch approach is probably the most easily implemented in schools where staff, facilities, and resources are limited. By selecting certain epochs and studying them in depth, it is possible to coordinate both staff and resources.

The Culture-Epoch approach permits teachers to teach. It gives each member of the team an opportunity to teach imaginatively, creatively, and effectively in areas each knows best.

Another advantage of the Culture-Epoch approach is that if you believe developments in art, architecture, music, and literature are products of an age or the artistic expression of a period in time, then these developments are seen in context by students. When art, music, and literature are studied alone or taught in nice neat compartments which in reality only help the office count up units for graduation, students very often fail to see the relationships or the interdependence of the arts on the economy of the time.

My colleagues at the University are now beginning to see that some of this training and I dare say infatuation with history as a discipline is the result of fine work by teams of teachers in humanities courses employing the Culture-Epoch approach. Thanks to you, I now see two direct results at the college

and university levels. First, your example of being interesting and exciting teachers is making our undergraduates much more critical of the teaching going on in higher education. The second effect you are having is that there are several of us at the University of Illinois who are actively working toward an interdisciplinary program in which students may take a major in and also be certified as teachers of humanities.

Finally, the most eloquent testimonial on behalf of the humanities courses comes from students. One student wrote, "Humanities has enriched my outlook on my environment. I was inspired because we were free, free from the same old methods, free to do and say what we wanted and in any way we felt we should."

--John R. Dahl

EXCERPTS FROM "HUMANITIES: A GREAT IDEAS COURSE"

Selecting or limiting the Great Ideas to be studied is something each school and each teacher must consider individually. One school may transplant another's package of humanities, another's selection of the great ideas. But will the transplant cause life or death? Does your humanities program reflect your values? your school's or your community's values? Why do you or your school want a humanities program?

We (Northport High School) wanted a course where there would be no hurry, no pressure to cover prescribed materials or to prepare for ritualistic examinations, but one where we could deal deliberately with pupils' concerns and questions, and where we could stay with any topic as long as class members were interested.

We wanted a course that could bring together some parts of a fragmented curriculum so that pupils and teachers could see that music, biology, literature, physics, art--all speak about the miracle and tragedy of being a human being.

We were after a course where "the proper study of man is man," where human values, be they in architecture, religion, or psychology, are a fit subject for study.

We sought a course where grades and testing would be practically eliminated as factors of importance, where students would work because they wanted to confront something in themselves and in the materials being investigated.

We wanted a course where students would be the doers and which would be open-ended enough so that they could determine some part of the curriculum.

We wanted an environment, not for the elite, but for students of all interests and abilities.

We wanted an emphasis on human ideas and values, on recognition that the development of attitudes, skills, and understandings can be more important than the contents of a given course. We wanted not just acquisition of knowledge but a way of thinking and living and being.

Some of the great ideas considered have been (1) Why the humanities? What are they? (2) What is the human condition? (3) What ideas and values does the Old Testament present about humanity? (4) Psychology and the human condition.

We have had many misgivings and doubts about our procedures and choice of materials; about our problems and flounderings and flops we could descant in dismal detail. But about the basic nature of our course we have shed our hesitation. For in spite of the looseness of the program and the groping of the teachers, our students have been responsive and enthusiastic.

To have a humanities course for a small, elite group seems fraudulent and antithetical to the spirit of the humanities. Ultimately, not a humanities course but a humanities school is what is needed.

--Morris Saxe

PANEL SUGGESTS DESIGN FOR THE GOOD PROGRAM

Following the consideration of criteria for what programs in the humanities ought to be and critical analyses of how programs are, Prudence Dyer and her panel--Rosemary Kelley, Shirley Trusty, Fred Wieck, and George Prigmore--sketched the design of a Good Program. Based upon recorders' discussion notes from the small groups, the panel considered the meaning of the Good Program. Recognizing meaning in any work of art (such as a masterpiece in a humanities program) brings insight into more than the surface problem or technique, more than the organization or materials, more than the medium. Meaning in the Good Program (as in any work of art) is achieved through the sum of the idea, the medium as used by the artist, the design or composition, and the focus.

Before the team of teachers begin to develop their Good Program, they need to consider the dimensions of their subject. The study of the humanities--the creative expressions of man--requires both cognitive and affective skills and understandings, skills essential to creating products as well as those necessary for understanding and interpreting them. Within the humanities one may identify components such as art or literature, each with subdivisions.

Each of the works of art, the creative expressions, reflects both the creator and the forces at work on the creator. Each is an expression of man--of his joy, his concern, his sorrow, his anger, his search, his exultation. Since man has created his art for the purpose of expressing some idea or feeling, each work of art reflects his values and his ideas, as well as his techniques and skills. The structure of the humanities program, then, needs to encompass the study of the ideas and values held by man, his artistic means of expressing them, and his compulsion to express them.

The Good Program has an idea: a purpose characterized by a commitment by the teachers that they (with whatever approach they choose) are working with the right thing in the right way.

The Good Program has its artists, working with media: teamsmanship among the faculty, with a non-dogmatic approach or manner which utilizes inductive procedures.

The Good Program has composition: a design for the development of attitudes and values, with opportunities for all students (not just a select group) to confront values, to inquire into issues, to examine and evaluate exemplars, to react freely.

The Good Program has focus: it considers issues relatable to all students, ideas of interest in works which challenge all, and resources--both human and material--which are the best in the world and the best in the community; and all these in a time span preferably the length of the child's time in school--twelve or thirteen or fourteen years.

The Good Program, through pupil involvement, achieves meaning: perceptual, creative, imaginative, evaluative.

The Good Program strives to allow all students to study man and his uniquely human qualities in order that they might know that the study of man with his dignity is a force--the force by which all humanity may survive.

PARTICIPANTS PROJECT IDEAS FOR THEIR OWN SCHOOLS

Participants, meeting in small groups, projected plans for implementing in their home schools ideas generated at the Conference. Recorders' notes reveal the following points which they agree need to be considered:

Objectives: (1) Does the scope of the approach provide opportunities for the child to consider one or more value in depth? (2) Does the scope of the approach provide opportunities for the child to consider one or more medium of artistic expression in depth? (3) Do the objectives, supported by the

opportunities and activities within the study, encompass specific criteria questions appropriate for the particular school?

Materials and Approach: (1) Does the program provide a wide range of materials and approaches to accommodate individual differences? foster creativity? appeal to the several senses? refine taste and develop discrimination? (2) Does the program allow for feedback from the pupils to ascertain points to be deleted, ideas to be strengthened? (3) Are the materials well organized and well documented for ease in finding sources, etc.?

Evaluation: Does the teacher provide opportunities for pupil evaluation which will (1) require divergent thinking? (2) assess pupil's participation in the study? (3) evaluate pupil's creative products and processes? (4) analyze pupil's growth in accepting values? (5) encourage pupil's reactions to the materials and the study? (6) provide insight into his own unique heritage and self?

Teacher Preparation: Does the school provide time for teacher planning within teams? Do the schools and universities share in the preparation of teachers to develop humanities programs suitable for the individual schools? Are the state departments of education providing leadership in the development of programs appropriate for the various communities?

(Note: The following universities have been identified as ones now offering preparation for certification in the humanities: Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio; Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville; San Francisco State College; University of South Florida, Tampa; Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Wayne State University, Detroit; and Drake University, Des Moines.)

EXCERPTS FROM "THE NEW HUMANITIES AND THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY"

In this age of questioning, of gnawing doubts, of agonizing reappraisal, the humanities cannot any longer be shielded from the strong X-ray of inquiry.

The relevance of the new science and math is clear. What we seek is the relevance of the new humanities. Baffled by what we see emerging, we try to examine the humanistic creations of our time for signs of lucidity, logic, and relevance.

Begin with music: not just cacophonous music, not just prepared pianos and twelve-tone compositions and electronic tape music. Music has suddenly become only one pigment on the palette, the other pigments being light, color, noise, posters, dance, pop art, films--you name it. Is it structured? Is it neat? Does it have recognizable form? Can it be analyzed?

Or take drama. Where are the three-act plays of yesteryear--two and a half hours in length, digestible, scrutible, logical; with unity, coherence, emphasis, climax, and denouement? They are going-going-gone. Who has taken stage center? Edward Albee, Harold Pinter, Samuel Beckett, Eugene Ionesco. The new playwrights do not even rage any more--or at least not in words that we understand. They are not thundering against slums and segregation, against poverty and nuclear fission. Things are cool, very cool.

Or take the most popular of all the performing arts, the cinema. . . .

What are these creative people telling us?

In a thousand ways, our culture is doing daily violence to the forms and shapes civilization has been fashioning for us ever since the Reformation and the Renaissance--or even, perhaps, since civilized man emerged from the swamps of Gothic Europe. Caught in this maelstrom of the late twentieth century, how do we expect our adolescents to respond?

What must be happening to their values? What in the world can today's young people possibly make of their parents, paralyzed, disoriented, incapable of helping them to withstand--at least to understand--this fantastic tidal wave?

The heroes of the past may be our heroes of the present. But they are not heroes to twenty-first century man--the man who is a child today--the man who will come to his full power in the next century, which many of us will not even live to see. In these driving, reckless decades every humanist must ask himself, What am I doing for the twenty-first century? I have the future in my bones. What are my goals? What are humanity's goals?

To the child who was born in the past fifteen years, the twenty-first century is nothing bizarre; it is not science fiction. Today's children will be in their thirties and forties in the year 2000. Most of their important work will still be ahead of them.

It is thus obvious that the humanities in today's schools must form new goals--goals that will not be realized in this decade or in this century, goals that will inspire those twenty-first century men and women who happened to have been children of the twentieth century.

Let me generalize and suggest that the goal of the humanities in the twenty-first century might be not just a scholarly analysis of all that is past but a reevaluation of what is important and what is unimportant. I submit that he who said history should be studied "to help the student appreciate what it means to be a man" said something very helpful--and humanistic. "What it means to be a man." It means to know that men are ambitious, men are frail, men are brave, men are slothful, men are passionate, men are vengeful, men are idealists, men are cynics, men are generous, men are curious, and men

are sly. It means that these humanistic characteristics govern men's responses to all stimuli, whether of literature, of history, of government, of disputation, of science, of aesthetics, of learning, or of love.

Is there yet no place in the humanities for study of the Poor People's March on Washington? or the laying seige to our universities? or the hundred years of racial discrimination that fall as a deep shadow over our history? Might not the study of feudal law as it heralded today's landlord-tenant relations lead directly to identification of the laws protecting today's slum lords and thus carry us forward towards a glorious renaissance in our cities?

These are some of the humanistic challenges of the twenty-first century. These studies will teach today's teenagers what it means to be a coward, a bully, a black man, a hero, a leader, a soldier, a sharecropper. Look into the documents, the diaries, the letters. Seek out the autobiographies, the novels, the tracts, the minutes, the portraits, the songs, the hundred and thirty years of photographs and the fifty years of films.

The humanities may not be neat or tidy. They deal with the greatest mystery of all--the behavior of the human mind and human emotions. More difficult than science, the humanities are also more delicate, more elusive, but they are as dazzling as the crown jewels.

The humanists of our century may not be creating Galileos, Newtons, and Einsteins. But we should be more than satisfied if our efforts today result in producing a twenty-first century of Mozarts and Bernsteins, of Picassos and da Vincis, of Freuds and Bunches and Kings and Joyces and Roosevelts and Douglasses.

Then the humanities may display their own coat of arms, emblazoned with their own motto--"This is what it means to be a man."

--Robert Saudek

HAUNTING QUESTIONS REMAIN

Conference Chairman Jerry Walker captured the essence of the three days' questioning in his closing challenge. His questions--after all others are considered--stand as a continuing reminder of what humanities programs might become:

1. Do you have a humanities program or just a humanities course?
2. If you have a humanities program, is it fully articulated? Does it make ever-increasing demands on the students' perceptual, cognitive, and evaluative skills?
3. Is your humanities program or course only for a select few, who are usually the gifted students?

4. Isn't a humanities program just as valuable for all students as it is for a select few?
5. If your humanities program is based on cultural epochs, is it more than just a survey of the music, literature, and art of the times?
6. If your humanities program is based on American studies, is it more than just a convenient way to provide a more meaningful context for teaching the same old historical facts and literary selections?
7. If your humanities program is based on aesthetics, does it set the standard for aesthetic response so high that only a few have the knowledge and skills to qualify them to have an aesthetic response, or does it admit that a powerful aesthetic response need not be intellectual and need not come only in the presence of "great art"?
8. If your humanities program is based on great ideas, does it accept the fact that great ideas may be challenged and may be rendered meaningless by modern conditions? And does it recognize that students, too, are capable of formulating great ideas?
9. Whatever the organizing thread of your humanities program, does it fully involve students in the two most human of all endeavors--manipulating symbols and imagining what might be?

POSTSCRIPT

A participant was overheard remarking, "I came to the Conference seeking answers. Now I'm going home to find answers to new questions right in my own school."